

Response

A. Introduction

Claims 1-28 were pending prior to entry of the preceding amendments, and *claims 1, 3, 6-14, 17-22, 24-26, and 28-31 are pending now*. The Examiner initially rejected:

1. Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 14-20, and 24-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,843,197 to Nixon;
2. Claims 6 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over combined disclosures of the Nixon patent and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0014920 of Shirakawa;
3. Claims 8 and 23 under section 103(a) as obvious over the Nixon patent;
4. Claims 21-22 under section 103(a) as obvious over combined disclosures of the Nixon patent and U.S. Patent No. 3,069,796 to Ruter; and
5. Claims 4-6 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite.

Without conceding the correctness of any of these initial rejections, Applicant has revised various claims in manners designed to resolve the Examiner's concerns.

B. Section 112 Rejection

According to the Examiner, claim 4 [*sic* claim 5] is indefinite because of its inclusion of the words "soft," "high," and "low." The Examiner additionally rejected claims 15-16 as purportedly improperly defining a net size "by the size of an unknown, unclaimed structure." While disagreeing with both of the Examiner's contentions, Applicant has cancelled claims 5 and 15-16 without prejudice. Applicant accordingly requests that the indefiniteness rejection of the Examiner under Section 112 be withdrawn.

C. Sections 102(b)/103(a) Rejections

Described in the application are textile armour systems useful in protecting targets from damage caused by shaped-charge warheads such as rocket propelled grenades (RPGs). An objective of the systems is to prevent shaped-charge jets from forming from RPGs. The systems accomplish this objective by strangulating the (typically hollow) nose cones of RPGs, causing the nose cones to crumple and, in turn, the firing mechanisms to fail. See Application at p. 1, ll. 3-5; p. 2, ll. 20-31; p. 3, ll. 8-22.

Independent claims 1, 24, and 30 exploit this feature of the invention.

Revised claim 1, for example, describes

Textile armour for protecting an object from an incoming rocket propelled grenade, comprising a net formed from a plurality of interconnecting synthetic plastic net strands, and corresponding support means to support the net in a fully extended condition at a predetermined distance from the object being protected, wherein ***the net is configured to strangulate a nose cone of the rocket propelled grenade*** before it impacts on the object being protected.

Claims 24 and 30 are similar, likewise referencing a net or textile section configured to strangulate the nose cone of an RPG.

The Nixon patent, by contrast, ***in no way relates to mitigating effects of RPGs***. Instead, it details a water-borne barrier for protecting vessels from incoming watercraft. The barrier includes mesh fencing material, a support structure, and pontoons. See Nixon, col. 3, ll. 42-51. According to the Nixon patent, the barrier attenuates “chemical energy due to an explosion of munitions or other explosive materials aboard the threat craft.” Id., col. 7, ll. 31-33. It does ***not*** act to strangulate ***any*** nose cones, however, much less such cones of shaped-charge warheads like

RPGs. Nor is this deficiency in the disclosure of the Nixon patent cured by any other reference cited by the Examiner. For at least this reason, therefore, Applicant requests that all pending claims be allowed.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.56, 1.97, and 1.98, Applicant identifies the material listed below and on the relevant form accompanying this submission:

NON-U.S. PATENT DOCUMENT

<u>Number</u>	<u>Country/Region</u>	<u>Date</u>
WO 2008/079001	WIPO/PCT	July 3, 2008

A copy of the listed document is enclosed. Applicant does not concede that the identified document, whose earliest priority date post-dates the earliest priority date of the application, constitutes prior art within the meaning of the United States patent laws.

Fees

Provided herewith is authorization to charge a credit card for \$180.00 for the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement. Applicant believes no other fee presently is due. However, if Applicant's belief is mistaken, the Commissioner is authorized to debit Deposit Account No. 11-0855 for any additional fee due as a consequence of Applicant's submission of this paper.

Conclusion

Applicant requests that the Examiner allow claims 1, 3, 6-14, 17-22, 24-26, and 28-31 and that a patent containing these claims issue in due course.

Respectfully submitted,



Dean W. Russell
Reg. No. 33,452
Attorney for the Assignee

OF COUNSEL:

Kilpatrick Stockton LLP
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
(404) 815-6528